

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-46 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 22, and 35 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-46 remain present for examination. Claims 1, 22, and 35 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Moore, Jr. et al. in view of Bhogal et al. and further in view of Chrabaszcz

Claims 1-8, 12, 17, 21-25, 27, 32, 35-37, 39, and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 7,035,270 to Moore, Jr. et al. ("Moore") in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 7,248,563 to Bhogal et al. ("Bhogal") and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,585 to Chrabaszcz ("Chrabaszcz").

Applicants submit that Moore discloses "an interface between an HFC network and an in-home network." (See Moore at Abstract.) Moore further discloses that the interface includes "[a] processor, a non-volatile memory and RAM." (See col. 4, lines 8-9 and Fig. 2.) Furthermore, Moore discloses that the interface which includes a processor and that the processor has the "ability to convert the in-home networking protocol-related information to HFC network parameters." (See Moore at col. 5, line 17-19).

Bhogal discloses "[a] system... for restricting access to a network using a network communications device. The network communications device includes multiple ports for providing access to a data processing system to the network." (Bhogal at Abs.). Chrabaszcz discloses "[a] method of automatically configuring a server system after a device has been hot added to the system, which includes the following acts: automatically detecting the hot added device; automatically configuring the device; automatically identifying a device type for the

device; automatically determining the location where the device has been hot added; automatically loading a driver corresponding to the hot added device; and automatically modifying a configuration file so as to integrate the hot added device into the system.” (Chrabaszcz at Abs.).

In contrast, claims 1, 22, and 35, as amended, recite “*a medical-data collection device* that collects medical data from the patient, wherein the medical-data collection device is interfaced with a transport medium internal to the customer patient premises” and “a network interface device disposed at a perimeter of the residential patient premises, the network interface device having... plurality of microservers are adapted to receive information from the external transport medium and includes software and hardware for implementing *a first medical-monitoring microserver* to process the collected medical data and *a second medical-monitoring microserver* to exchange the data between the internal transport medium and the external transport medium[, and] a processor in communication with the plurality of microservers and having software instructions *to coordinate transmission of the collected medical data* over the transport medium external to the residential patient premises”. (emphasis provided). Applicants submit that no such limitations can be found in any of Moore, Bhogal, or Chrabaszcz. As such, Applicants submit that claims 1, 22, and 35 are patentable over Moore, Bhogal, and Chrabaszcz, either individually, or when combined in any combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, claims 2-21, 23-34 and 36-46 depend from independent claims 1, 22, and 35, respectively. Thus, by virtue of their dependence on an allowable independent claim, Applicants submit that claims 2-21, 23-34 and 36-46 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 26, 28, 30, 33-34, 38, 40, 42, and 45-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore, Bhogal and Chrzbaszcz in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,127 to Rakib ("Rakib").

Claims 14, 29 and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore, Bhogal and Chrzbaszcz in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,616 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson").


Claims 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 26, 28-30, 33-34, 38, 40-42, 45, and 46 depend from one of independent claims 1, 22, and 35. Thus, by virtue of their dependence on an allowable independent claim, Applicants submit that claims 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 26, 28-30, 33-34, 38, 40-42, 45, and 46 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:cmb

61799679 v1